



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT HEBRAICA AND JUDAICA

Monumenta Talmudica. Erster Band : Bibel und Babel. Bearbeitet von SALOMON FUNK, Rabbiner in Boskowitz. Wien und Leipzig: ORION-VERLAG, 1913. pp. vii + 346. (Four fascicles.)

Monumenta Talmudica. Zweiter Band : Recht. Bearbeitet von SALOMON GANDZ. Wien und Leipzig: ORION-VERLAG, 1913. pp. xvi + 80. (One fascicle.)

THE Talmud, owing to the nature of its origin, lacks a logical arrangement of subjects. In academic discussions irrelevant arguments are bound to crop up now and then, and the Talmud accordingly abounds in digressions. Thus, while treating of the principal laws of damages, the Amoraim find analogous points in the principal laws of defilement. One thought suggests another, and many laws, which at first sight appear entirely different, are shown to be similar and to be derived from one principle. It may be said that almost immediately after the conclusion of the Talmud, about 500 C. E., the problem of re-arranging that vast literature occupied the minds of Jewish scholars. The *Halakot Gedolot* was no doubt an attempt in that direction. Notable success was later on achieved by Isaac al-Fasi with his Compendium. The compendia and codes, of which there is a vast literature, had it as their object to classify the halakic matter of the Talmud, as that branch was considered by far the most important. But the haggadic part, too, found its 'redeemer', and the '*En Ya'aqob*', compiled by Jacob Ibn Ḥabib, has deservedly enjoyed great popularity. In modern times scientific monographs have appeared now and again on special subjects in the Talmud. The investigation of medicine by Preuss may be mentioned here as a remarkable achievement. All these attempts, however, important though they are, have not exhausted all the subjects dealt with in the talmudic literature. With the advance of Jewish

learning the need was felt of making the contents of the Talmud accessible to more students than those that are willing to devote their entire life to the study of this vast subject. Two possible methods immediately suggest themselves for the purpose of carrying out such a plan, both fraught with almost insurmountable difficulties. The most natural method would be to publish a critical edition of the Talmud in its present form and provide it with thoroughgoing and exhaustive indices which would enable the reader to find the passages needed for his researches. The excellent index volume of the *Kitab al-Agani* proves that a great deal can be done on these lines, although one would readily admit that the difficulties in indexing the Talmud are not to be compared with those of the former. The second method is to classify the Talmud according to subjects and to edit each class separately. Certain advantages would be derived from such a treatment, as the student would have all the passages arranged for him. It is, however, almost inconceivable that a method could be devised whereby all passages would be included, for a great number of them defies all attempts at classification. It is the second course which the editors of the *Monumenta Talmudica*, Drs. S. Funk, W. A. Neumann, and others, have adopted. The plan is well conceived, but we shall presently see what degree of success is likely to attend its execution.

According to the prospectus issued by the editors all the subjects are to be divided into six general groups: I. Bibel und Babel; II. Recht; III. Theologie; IV. Volksüberlieferungen; V. Geschichte; VI. Profanes Wissen. These general classes are subdivided into various sections and subsections which seem to overlap. As only the first volume (Bibel und Babel) and part of the second have hitherto been published, it is hard to judge whether all the ground will be covered. But the observation may be hazarded that, unless the editors are not too strict with their classifications, many a passage will have to be excluded. A still more serious objection may be raised against the title of the first volume. *Bibel und Babel* is no subject by itself as compared with law, theology, and the others. At the beginning of

this century this was the title of a controversy that raged among Assyriologists, owing to a theory advanced by Friedrich Delitzsch, but one fails to see how this can be regarded as a suitable title for classifying talmudic passages. All the references to Babylon and the Babylonians could easily be grouped under the heading of history, which, according to the prospectus, contains: A. Greeks and Romans; B. Iranians; C. Jews. It seems quite obvious that the Babylonians ought to find a place among these nations.

But disregarding this meaningless title, we may proceed to examine the contents of this volume, the publication of which has already been completed. In order to give the reader an idea of the variety of subjects incorporated in this volume, I shall quote the principal parts of the table of contents, omitting the subsections, which are extremely numerous. A. Land und Leute: I. Name des Landes Babel; II. Gewässer; III. Fruchtbarkeit; IV. Bewirtschaftung; V. Verkehrsmittel; VI. Steuern; VII. Wohnungen; VIII. Städte; IX. Bevölkerung; X. Kulte. B. Babylonische Geschichte: I. Assyrisches; II. Neubabylonisches; III. Medopersisches Reich—Chron. Zusammenfassung. C. Weltbild: I. Himmlische Weltordnung: 1, Schöpfung; 2, Himmel; 3, Gestirne; II. Irdische Weltordnung: 1, Erde; 2, Bedingtheit des Irdischen; 3, Land Israel. D. Weltanschauung: I. Astrologie und babylonische Astronomie; II. Das Buch der Weisheit; III. Abbilder der Weltordnung: 1, Der Mensch; 2, Salomons Thron; 3, Salomons Hippodrom; 4, Heilige Zahlen. In going through this multiplicity of disconnected headings one is tempted to remark, even at the risk of being considered flippant, that the compiler chose the title *Bibel und Babel* in accordance with the etymology of the name Babel given in Gen. 11. 9. There is nothing but confusion and chaos. By adding a few more headings Dr. Funk might easily have included the entire rabbinic literature in this volume. It is pan-Babylonian with a vengeance—in a new sense. It is almost a kind of practical application of Jensen's theory expressed in his book *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*.

If the grouping of subjects in this volume is termed chaotic,

there is no adjective to designate the passages themselves that are inserted under the various headings. A sign of interrogation constantly shapes itself in the reader's mind. Some of the passages appear to have been put there to fill up space. In many cases it is hard to discover the relation between the headings and the passages. Nor is there any attempt made to exhaust all passages referring to a certain matter. In a quite arbitrary manner the compiler quotes a few sentences, and then passes on to another subject. Thus in enumerating the Babylonian towns mentioned in the Talmud, he inserts eighteen references to the town of Maḥuza, and one fails to understand why he just included those and excluded a great many others, as for instance those of Baba meṣi'a 77 a and Baba batra 7 a. The former especially would be a very appropriate description of Maḥuza, and should certainly have been inserted here. It is true that this passage is actually given later on under the heading of *Beschäftigung*, No. 451 (p. 80); but Dr. Funk has no scruples about quoting a reference twice. Comp. Nos. 110 and 222 which are identical. Similarly No. 259 is part of 161. As if he desired to startle the reader all the more, Dr. Funk begins his series of references to Maḥuza with a passage in which that town is not mentioned. That passage reads (קוצות ויכביות) רבא שרי להו ברנלת (No. 201). To justify this intrusion, Dr. Funk in his translation adds after *Raba* the words *der in Machuza wohnte*. But why just this passage, and not hundreds of others of a similar character? Nor is there any consistency or system in the manner of quoting the passages. Some of them are given in their entirety, although only one or two words are necessary for the classification, while of others the compilers sees fit to quote merely a few words which do not even form a complete sentence. Examples to illustrate this lack of system can be found on almost every page. Thus No. 143 refers to the town of Dewil, and the entire passage is given; but No. 144 only has רב איקלע לרמיהא (the *dagesh* in the *ק* is omitted throughout!), while No. 146 consists of רב הונא מדספרתא. No. 152 begins with the words רב המנונא איקלע לדרומתא, and here the entire narrative is given. But No. 278,

which begins in a similar way (רַבִּינָא אֵיקָלַע לְסִירָא דְּפֶרֶת), is cut off abruptly, although in the next sentence that town is mentioned once more in a manner which in other cases is given by the compiler as a special paragraph. Such fragmentary sentences do not convey anything to the reader, and as they are not exhaustive, they are not of great use. A much greater service would have been rendered by Dr. Funk had he furnished a complete index of all the names of places mentioned in the Talmud. In a few cases the compiler considered it advisable to affix Rashi's notes at the end of the passages, but no reason can be discovered why just these notes and not many others of a similar nature. Thus in No. 342 he gives part of Mishnah Kelim 23, 2 on account of the words וּמְדֻבָּה הַמִּירִית mentioned therein, and there is no need to adorn the text with Rashi's note. Had Dr. Funk been consistent, he might have added notes of mediaeval Jewish commentators to every passage. In No. 612, which is also one of the few 'superior' paragraphs found worthy to be embellished with Rashi's note, Dr. Funk mistranslates a very easy sentence. The entire passage consists of מַאי פְּרוּהָ ? אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף פְּרוּהָ אֲמֹנִישִׁי [רש"י] מַאי פְּרוּהָ ? אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף פְּרוּהָ אֲמֹנִישִׁי (Yoma 35 a). This is classified under the heading of *Kultur* of the Medo-Persian empire. Rashi's sentence is rendered *Ein Baumeister, der ein Zauberer war und Parwah geheissen hat*. But the word בָּנָה is a verb, and not a noun. It should be vocalized בִּנְיָה, and the sentence is to be translated: *a certain magician named Parwah built it*. [A builder is בְּנֵי, not בִּנְיָי.]

It is hard to say how far Dr. Funk co-operated with his colleagues who are to compile the other volumes, and consulted them about the general arrangement, but it is obvious that he encroached upon the provinces of others. A glaring instance is No. 347, which is a long passage from 'Abodah zarah 2 a and b. There can be no doubt that the greater part of it belongs to Roman history. Similarly No. 501 is a proverb, and should be incorporated in volume IV, class E of which, according to the prospectus, is to contain: *Rätsel, Fabel, Sprichwörter*. Now Dr. Funk classifies this passage under the heading of *Assyrisches*

Reich (Sennacherib), although the reference to Assyria occurs only in the biblical quotation, and has nothing to do with the talmudic statement. Some references are given inaccurately. Thus No. 74 does not occur in *Baba meš'a* 106 b, as stated by the compiler, but in *Baba batra* 8 a. Part of this paragraph is also quoted in *Baba meš'a* 108 a.

Examples to illustrate the lack of system in this volume can be given by the hundreds, but the few instances that have already been cited will suffice to show how little Dr. Funk contributed to the logical and scientific arrangement of rabbinic literature. In justice to him it may be said that the fault is not entirely his. When one begins with an impossible classification, one is bound to be driven to all sorts of absurdities. And it should also be observed that the part dealing with Babylonian history is, with the exception of a few irrelevant passages, fairly well done. But why take such a vague and inappropriate title?

In a work of such magnitude minor details may perhaps be overlooked. Nevertheless attention should be drawn to the fact that the vocalization of the texts is far from satisfactory, especially as this feature of the work is emphatically referred to in the preface. Scholars often experience difficulties in punctuating the Aramaic dialect of the Babylonian Talmud, and tradition can certainly not be relied upon. At the same time a certain degree of accuracy can be attained by a judicious comparison of biblical Aramaic, Syriac, and the other dialects. The grammars of Levias and Margolis are of great service. Of recent years many Genizah fragments have been published which help to establish the exact vocalization of some doubtful words. There is, therefore, no excuse for offering an inaccurate vocalization. Moreover, in this volume errors occur even in biblical words. Before giving some characteristic examples of the mistakes which can be found on every page, I should like to remark that, according to the preface, Dr. Funk is not responsible for this part of the work, as the texts were vocalized by Prof. Dr. M. Berkowicz. In the following notes the first and second numbers refer to the page and line, respectively. בְּקִרְיֹטוֹת (1, 2) should be בְּקִרְיֹטוֹת. The only exception is

Jud. 9. 48, which is probably corrupt. The form גָּלִי (2, 3) does not suit the context; read גָּלִי or גָּלִי. Instead of לְמַטְעֵתָן (3, 15) read לְמַטְעֵתָן. From Ezekiel 13. 9 we know that the construct state of פָּתַח is פָּתַח, not פָּתַח (3, 15). The punctuation of לְיִחְסִין (4, 16) cannot be justified; read לְיִחְסִין. It is a form like יוֹלָד, which mediaeval grammarians used to explain as shortened from מְיֹלָד. It was, however, shown by Barth in his essay *Das passive Qal und seine Participien* that it is the old passive participle of Kal. A sieve in Hebrew is קֶבֶר, not קֶבֶר (5, 4). As the root of גֹּב a den is גָּבַב (comp. Arabic جَبَّ and Aramaic גָּבַב), it should be vocalized גֹּב, not גֵּב (6, 2). See Dan. 6. 13. טַעֲנִי is an active participle + אָנָּה, and should be vocalized טַעֲנִי, not טַעֲנִי (7, 25). As the root of מִלְחָמָה is מָלַח, it should be vocalized מְמַלְחָמָה, not מְמַלְחָמָה (9, 11). יְחִירְתָּם (9, 12) is plural, and therefore cannot qualify נְטִירוֹתָא which is singular; read יְחִירְתָּם. For דְּבַעֲנִי (10, 1) read דְּבַעֲנִי. Genizah fragments have אִנְשֵׁי; we should therefore vocalize אִנְשֵׁי, not אִנְשֵׁי (11, 2 and elsewhere). This vocalization is also borne out by Biblical Aramaic, Arabic, and Syriac. For מְיָמָה (11, 6) read מְיָמָה, as it is an active participle. מְיָמָה (11, 15) is an impossible form; read מְיָמָה. Instead of תָּלַח (12, 13) read תָּלַח. For וְרָעָה (14, 8) read וְרָעָה. For בְּבִלְיָא (16, 2) read בְּבִלְיָא. From 2 Chron. 19. 7 we know that we ought to vocalize לְמַפֵּחַ, not לְמַפֵּחַ (17, 5). Instead of אִתְּמִי (18, 11) read אִתְּמִי. For the impossible חָיִי (23, 4) read חָיִי. In an Aramaic text עֲבָדִי (24, 9) is out of place; read עֲבָדִי. For דְּקוּלָּאִי (25, 7) read דְּקוּלָּאִי which is a well-known *nomen agentis* in Aramaic. The same word is vocalized דְּקוּלָּאִי (79, 19), which is a tribute to the punctuator's consistency and accuracy. For עִבְדָּךָ (27, 5) read עִבְדָּךָ or עִבְדָּךָ. For וְנִשִּׁי (27, 7) read וְנִשִּׁי. Instead of בְּיוֹפֵן (29, 1) read בְּיוֹפֵן. The Waw is merely a *mater lectionis*. רוּחָה (29, 9) is a participle, not a noun; it should be vocalized רוּחָה, not רוּחָה. There is no way of parsing a form like מְסַפְקָא (31, 19); read מְסַפְקָא or מְסַפְקָא. In the next line read מְסַפְקָה, not מְסַפְקָה. From Syriac we know that the correct vocalization is דְּבַחָה, not דְּבַחָה (33, 6). The latter is traditional; but comp. also Arabic وَكَّ and وَكَّ. The root of צָרִי they tied up is צָרַר; hence read צָרִי, not

צִרוֹ (34, 11). Read מְצִינָא instead of מְצִינָא (38, 15). For דְּמַפְקָא (40, 9) read דְּמַפְקָא. A peculiar error is וְכָאִי (45, 16) for וְכָאִי. For סְבוּלָאָה (46, 15) read סְבוּלָאָה. An *entrance* in biblical Hebrew is קְבוּא, which becomes קְבוּי in the Mishnah. Comp. בְּרִיאָה and בְּרִיָּה. Hence קְבוּי (46, 20) is impossible. For עֲמוּרָאִי (49, 4) read עֲמוּרָאִי. Instead of בְּחוּלָא דְמוֹעֵרָא (53, 7) read בְּחוּלָא. As נחית is no doubt a perfect, it should be נְחִית, not נָחִית (54, 18 and elsewhere). An impossible combination is שְׁאֵינִי מְקוּרָה (57, 11); read מְקוּרָה. For כְּעוֹשֶׁרָה, כִּיפִיָּה (58, 13, 14) read כְּעוֹשֶׁרָה, respectively. As מְדוּר (64, 22) is construct state, it should be מְדוּר, not מְדוּר. All available data, manuscripts and the cognate languages, prove that we should vocalize לְשָׁנָא, not לְשָׁנָא (66, 24). Comp. Dan. 3. 29. For מְצִינָאִי (69, 21) read מְצִינָאִי. Instead of וְרִשְׁאֵין (74, 10) read וְרִשְׁאֵין. Read נְחוּתִי for נְחוּתִי (78, 11 and elsewhere). Instead of עֲקָרָה (80, 15) read עֲקָרָה. הַמְבוּיוֹן (82, 23) should be הַמְבוּיוֹן. The plural of סִלָּת should be סִלָּתוֹת, not סִלָּתוֹת (83, 16). For רִיבָה (84, 31) read רִיבָה. (See my essay 'The Participial Formations of the Geminate Verbs', *ZAW.*, 30, p. 222.) A comparison of אָנִי and אָנִי would clearly show that we have to vocalize אָנִי, not אָנִי (86, 4). For מִיָּקֶר (92, 10) read מִיָּקֶר. From Jud. 14. 8 we know that the correct vocalization is מִפְּלָת, not מִפְּלָת (93, 17). The perfect Nithpael of נָאָה is נִתְנָאָה, not נִתְנָאָה (97, 14). The form אִיתִיבִיה which occurs frequently in the Talmud is no doubt Afel of הוּב. It should therefore be אִיתִיבִיה, the Yod representing a vocal shewa, or at the most אִיתִיבִיה, but not אִיתִיבִיה (106, 15). The last would suit a fanciful etymology אִיתִי בִיה. The form אִפִּילִי instead of אִפִּילִי occurs several times in this volume, e.g. 107, 2. The Hifil הִשְׁמִיעִי does not suit the context of 116, 15, 16. Read הִשְׁמִיעִי. For מְפִנֵּק (118, 14) read מְפִנֵּק. The form תְּמִנִּי (138, 20) is impossible; read תְּמִנִּי. For אִמְנָתוֹ (181, 7) read אִמְנָתוֹ or אִמְנָתוֹ. Comp. Cant. 7. 2. נִבְרָאת (183, 7 and elsewhere) represents the so-called 'traditional' pronunciation; read נִבְרָאת. For נִפְקִי (187, 24) read נִפְקִי. As הִבְנָאִי (189, 15) is a *fa' 'al* form, it should be הִבְנָאִי, not הִבְנָאִי. Read יְרִקִין, יְרִקִים for יְרִקִין, יְרִקִים (191, 11, 12), respectively. Because Prov. 6. 6 and other verses have יִתְכֶּם in a pause, there is no reason why this word should be

so vocalized in the middle of a sentence; read וְהָבִים (195, 20). For מְעִטָּר (202, 21) read מַעְטָר. Instead of לְלֶדֶד (205, 20) read לְלֹדֶד. From Num. 25. 8 we know that a *vaulted tent* is קִפָּה, not קוּפָּה (218, 21). For הַשִּׁיבָתוֹ (224, 15) read הַשִּׁיבָתוֹ. From Syriac and Arabic we know to vocalize אֶפְבָּא, not אִפְבָּא (244). As גּוֹלָם with suffixes is גּוֹלָמִי (Ps. 139. 16) it should be vocalized גּוֹלָם, not גּוֹלָם (250). The vocalization of תָּנוּ רַבָּנֵינוּ has in this volume undergone three stages of evolution. It started out as traditional תָּנִינוּ (15, 15), developed into the hybrid form תָּנִנוּ (17, 11 and elsewhere), and finally emerged as the accurate תָּנוּ (256). For בְּשִׁבְחָה (260) read בְּשִׁבְחָה. The word עִסָּה *dough* is best derived from the root עָסַם *he pressed*; hence read עָפָה not עִפָּה (268). For עֲבֹדָה (269) read עֲבֹדָה. Comp. 1 Kings 7. 26. Elsewhere in this volume it is עֲבֹדָה, e. g. 209, 17.

The commentary at the end of this volume is more like a series of interesting excursus rather than detailed notes appertaining to the various texts. Although these excursus are for the greater part irrelevant, they are replete with Assyriological lore, and may be regarded as the redeeming feature of the volume. The indices, too, are well compiled.

Decidedly superior is the second volume containing legal passages, of which the first fascicle has hitherto been published. This superiority is immediately noticeable from the technical arrangement. Whereas in the first volume there are numerous blanks, owing to the lack of proportion between the Hebrew texts and the German translation which are printed side by side, in this volume the two parts are printed in such a manner as to be of almost equal length. The method of giving the references is also improved to a considerable extent. But by far of greater importance are the intrinsic merits of this volume, the value of which is clearly brought out by comparison with the first. Here we at last arrive at a proper arrangement and a thorough treatment of the subject. This is to some extent due to the circumstance that law is a classifiable subject. Dr. Gandz, author of this volume, shows a thorough mastery of this branch of research, and judging from this fascicle, we may expect from him an

extremely valuable contribution. This fascicle contains passages referring to the laws appertaining to the king, the court of justice, and the priests. Each section is preceded by an excellent *résumé* and a short bibliographical sketch. The passages are well chosen, and are calculated to acquaint the reader with the rabbinic literature treating of these branches. The notes, which are printed under the texts, greatly contribute to the elucidation of the passages. On the whole one can have no hesitation in asserting that the texts are well edited and annotated, and Dr. Gandz deserves praise for this part of the work, apart from the classification.

The vocalization, too, is done with almost masoretic accuracy, and it is quite evident that great care was bestowed on this feature of the volume. The orthography of the Talmud was rightly changed to suit the vocalized texts, and practically all vowel letters were omitted. Thus מאי is usually spelt מי. 'Traditional' pronunciations are frequently discarded when they are found to be indefensible in the light of recent discoveries and comparative grammar. Thus קל וחומר is correctly vocalized קֶל וְחֹמֶר (e.g. p. 48) instead of קֶל וְחֹמֶר, which is an incongruous combination of a noun and an adjective. On the other hand לומד לומר (p. 3 and throughout the book) instead of תלמוד לומר will not meet with universal approval. Hardly anything is gained by this change, and the phrase does not become more lucid through this vocalization. Moreover we should expect תלמוד. In connexion with these improved pronunciations it is to be regretted that Dr. Gandz did not consider it necessary to call attention to tradition and to justify the alteration. There are also several cases where tradition is unnecessarily adhered to. Thus מִצְוָה (p. 4) and בֵּן (p. 22) should be מִצְוָה and בֶּן, respectively, as may be seen from the א which is found in the printed editions. Similarly, it is preferable to read בֶּן instead of בֵּן (p. 7), and מֶלֶךְ instead of מֶלֶךְ (p. 7). הַרְיוֹנָה (p. 27) should rather be vocalized הַרְיוֹנָה. Comp. זִכָּאן. אֶבְרִים (p. 43) is against analogy; read אֶבְרִים. From Syriac we know that instead of בְּנֵי בִיתָה (p. 45) we ought to vocalize בְּנֵי בִיתָה, which is like גִּלְיָה. It is true that mediaeval Jewish poets pronounced it

יְבוּת (comp. Judah ha-Levi's *Diwan*, ed. Brody, vol. II, p. 163, l. 58); but this simply proves that this traditional error is several centuries old. The particle אֵין *yes*, as may be easily seen from Syriac, should be read אֵין, not אֵין (p. 50). There are also other mistakes, to some of which attention should be called here. For וְהִנֵּרַע (p. 5) read וְהִנֵּרַע. Instead of הִפֵּחַ (p. 8) read הִפִּיךָ. Vocalize שְׁמוֹנֶה for שְׁמוֹנֶה (p. 14). The plural of מָמוֹן is מְמוֹנוֹת, not מְמוֹנוֹת (p. 22). On p. 28 this word is correctly vocalized. The imperative is הִנְבֵּה, not הִנְבֵּה (p. 41). An impossible vocalization is וְלִטְעֶמְךָ (p. 54); read וְלִטְעֶמְךָ. As the context demands a singular, we ought to read הִיבְרָא, not הִיבְרָא (p. 56), which is plural. Instead of חָל (p. 64) read חָל, as the root is חוּל. The vocalization קָקִי (p. 74) for קָקִי is an unnecessary deviation from tradition.

Mishnaiot: Testo ebraico punteggiato, con traduzione italiana, proemio, e note illustrative. Di VITTORIO CASTIGLIONI, Triestino. Parte quarta.—Ordine dei danni (Nezikin). Edizione postuma, a cura di EMILIO SCHREIBER. Trattato Babà Kammà (Porta anteriore). Roma: Casa Editrice Italiana, 1913. pp. 51. (Two fascicles.)

Mishnaiot: Testo ebraico punteggiato, con traduzione italiana, proemio, e note illustrative. Di VITTORIO CASTIGLIONI, Triestino. Parte quarta.—Ordine dei danni (Nezikin). Edizione postuma, a cura di EMILIO SCHREIBER. Trattato Babà Metzi'a (Porta media). Roma: Casa Editrice Italiana, 1914. pp. 53-102. (Two fascicles.)

Der Mischnatraktat Orlah. Sein Zusammenhang und seine Quellen. Von Dr. ARTHUR ROSENTHAL. Berlin: N. ITZKOWSKI, 1913. pp. 48.

Books on Jewish scholarship in Italian are now a rare thing. After Luzzatto's brilliant achievements in practically all branches of Jewish science hardly anything was done in that language. Castiglioni's work was a kind of dying echo of former activity. Gloomy thoughts fill the mind when one reflects on the condition of Jewish learning in Italy, and one cannot help feeling apprehensive about its future in other countries. Store-houses of

valuable Hebrew manuscripts in themselves are evidently insufficient to attract scientific workers. Some more potent factors are needed. The edition of *Baba ḥamma* and *Baba meṣi'a* was prepared by Castiglioni in 1902, but for some reason or another the publication was delayed. Meanwhile Castiglioni died, and the task of seeing this edition through the press fell to his pupil Emil Schreiber. With the exception of the fact that the translation and the notes are in Italian there is nothing special about this edition. The introductions are brief, and merely give a definition of the tractates. The statements are made with accuracy and scholarly precision. Although there is nothing new in them, the hand of a master is everywhere discernible. The notes are comprehensive, and embody the best results of mediaeval Jewish commentators and modern scientific research. In order to explain the various laws Castiglioni makes ample use of the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmudim. The philological aspect, too, is well taken care of, and this part of the work as a whole makes a good impression.

The consonantal text does not differ from the usually printed editions. The few manuscripts of the Mishnah that are still extant do not offer many important variants, as may be readily seen from the mishnic parts of Rabinovicz's *Variae Lectiones*. Even old Genizah fragments seldom contain significant variants. This is no doubt due to the popularity of the Mishnah. For it is a recognized fact in all literatures that books that are widely read tend to become fixed even with their errors. Hence in order to establish a correct text of the Mishnah one must sometimes go beyond the Gemara, and at present this is hardly possible. With regard to the vocalization the matter is quite different. With an accurate knowledge of Hebrew grammar it is easy to punctuate mishnic texts correctly. It is true that now and again one stumbles over a new word not occurring in the Bible. But even then analogy can be followed with some degree of certainty. However lenient one wishes to be, one cannot help declaring this part of the present edition faulty. The book teems with errors of this kind. Even well-known biblical words and quotations are incorrectly vocalized. Misprints, too, are of very frequent occurrence, and it appears that

sufficient care was not bestowed upon this part of the work. It is rather inauspicious that the very first word contains an error. **אָרבע אַבֹּה** (p. 9) is impossible, as **אַב** is masculine in all its significations. Read **אַרבעָה**. As obvious misprints mention should be made of **שְׁלֵשָׁה** (p. 22) instead of **שְׁלִישָׁה**; **שְׁכָר** (p. 24) instead of **לְגוּשָׁה**; **שְׁמִין** (p. 27 twice) instead of **שְׁמִין**. Comp. p. 38 where this word is correctly vocalized. **בִּיזָה** (p. 38) for **בִּיזָא**; **מִצָּה** (p. 57) instead of **מִצָּא**; **יָא** (p. 62) instead of **יָה**; **שְׁנָאָנִי** (p. 85) instead of **שְׁנָהָנִי**. Apart from a vast number of mistakes which can reasonably be regarded as misprints these two tractates abound in errors which betray a lack of knowledge of Hebrew grammar. Some of them are due to the confusion of certain vowels in the Portuguese pronunciation. Thus probably arose **קָרִין** (p. 15 and elsewhere) instead of **קָרִין**, and **תָּמִים** (p. 16) instead of **תָּמִים**. The former is no doubt a *fa' 'al* form which is of frequent occurrence in the Mishnah, while the latter is derived from the root **תָּמַם**. To the same cause may be ascribed such mistakes as **מַעֲשֵׂה עֲצָמוֹ** (p. 18) instead of **מַעֲשֵׂה**, and **יֵשׁ** for **יֵשׁ** almost throughout the book. It would take up too much space to enumerate all the errors in these two tractates, but some of the most characteristic may be pointed out here. **לְשׁוֹךְ** (p. 10), read **לְשׁוֹךְ** (p. 11), read **לְשׁוֹךְ**. Instead of **בְּלִי** (*ibid.* and throughout the book) read **בְּלִי**, as the former is a pausal form. Instead of **הִזְק** (p. 14 and elsewhere) read **הִזְק**. The editor vocalizes the Hifil of this word correctly, but persists in giving a wrong form of the Hofal. As a rule no question marks are used in this edition, but as chance would have it, the question mark on p. 18 is erroneously employed: it should be placed before **וְהָ**, not after it. Instead of **הַנְּזִקִין** (p. 19) read **הַנְּזִקִין**, as the root is **נָזַק**. The form **נִשְׁתַּפֵּה** (p. 23) is impossible; read **נִשְׁתַּפֵּה**. This is quite a common error. As may be seen from Cant. 2. 9 **בְּתֵל** is a *kuṭl* form; hence **בְּתֵל** (p. 23) is inaccurate. Instead of **בְּמוֹסָרָה** (p. 24) read **בְּמוֹסָרָה**. For the correct vocalization of **עוֹבְרָה** (Baba kamma 5, 1) and **סוֹמָא** (*ibid.* 8, 1) see my remarks in *JQR.*, N. S., VI, p. 211. 1. **לְגִלָּה** (p. 25) is an unknown form; vocalize **לְגִלָּה**, as in Gen. 11. 30. For **מְגִלָּה** (p. 28) read **מְגִלָּה**. The editor did not stop to think about the root of

וְלִהְשֶׁבֶת אֲבָדָה (p. 29) ; vocalize וְלִהְשֶׁבֶת. Instead of שְׁפָרְצִיָּה (*ibid.*) read שְׁפָרְצִיָּה. A student accustomed to correctly vocalized Hebrew texts will be puzzled by the word לְיִנְיָה (p. 30). Read לְיִנְיָה. The editor evidently could not make up his mind as to the exact pronunciation of סָאָה. On p. 30 he vocalizes it several times סָאָה, but on p. 84 it becomes סָאָה. In his translation he transliterates it *Seah* throughout. Now this word is סָאָה in the Bible (e. g. 2 Kings 7. 1). הַפְּנִיָּישׁ (p. 30) in an unconscious attempt to introduce a *forma mixta* in the Mishnah. Vocalize הַפְּנִיָּישׁ. Even a denominative verb has to follow the elementary rules of grammar. As may be seen from 1 Kings and elsewhere the correct vocalization is כּוֹר, not כּוֹר (p. 31). For חוֹלִין (p. 34) read חוֹלִין. Instead of הַפְּהָרוֹת (p. 37) read הַפְּהָרוֹת, or הַפְּהָרוֹת. The editor rightly remarks in his notes that the singular of נֶשֶׁבִּין *nets* is נֶשֶׁב. Yet he vocalizes it נֶשֶׁבִּין in the text (*ibid.*). As the root of רוֹק *spittle* is רָקַק, we ought to read רָקִי instead of רוֹקִי (p. 40). See Job 7. 19. A curious mistake is הֶשֶׁב (p. 41) which is a quotation from Gen. 20. 7, where it is הֶשֶׁב. The editor should have at least taken the trouble to quote accurately. According to Cant. 7. 2 we ought to vocalize אֶמְנִין, or perhaps אֶמְנִין, if we take the Syriac ܐܡܢܝܢ into consideration. But Castiglioni is inconsistent, and vocalizes אֶמְנִין (p. 43), אֶמְנִין (p. 82), and אֶמְנִין (*ibid.* and p. 84). Instead of צֶמְרוֹ (p. 44) vocalize צֶמְרוֹ. See Hos. 2. 11. לְשִׁלִּיחַ בֵּית דִּין (p. 44) is an impossible construction ; read לְשִׁלִּיחַ. Instead of חוֹמְשׁוֹ (p. 45) read חֲמִשּׁוֹ. Syriac ܡܚܡܬܐ would seem to indicate that מוֹכֵם is an active participle ; hence read הַמּוֹכֵסִין instead of הַמּוֹכֵסִין (p. 47). Instead of יִשְׁבַּע (p. 49 and elsewhere) read יִשְׁבַּע. According to the Masoretic Text of Ps. 74. 6 we ought to read יִבְכְּשִׁיל, and not יִבְכְּשִׁיל (p. 51). Instead of מִשְׁנֵתָהּ, נִמְלָה (p. 56) read מִשְׁנֵתָהּ, נִמְלָה. In all likelihood שׁוֹכֵר is an active participle, and hence we should vocalize וְשׁוֹכְרִים, וְשׁוֹכְרִים (p. 57). Read וְיִמְאִינִין instead of וְיִמְאִינִין, and כִּיבּוֹ instead of כִּיבּוֹ (p. 58). For מְפִיזִין (p. 59) read מְפִיזִין. וּבְכַתֵּל יֵשֶׁן (p. 60) is an impossible construction ; read וּבְכַתֵּל. The word אֶפִּילִי is contracted of אֶפֶל + אִם, לִי, and should therefore be אֶפִּילִי, not אֶפִּילִי (*ibid.*). Arabic فَعَّاهُ proves that we should vocalize קָפָה, not קוּפָה (p. 62). Instead of the

impossible מִשְׁאֵי vocalize מִשְׁאֵי (p. 64). For לָהּ (p. 66, several times) read לָהּ. According to Ezekiel 4. 9 we ought to vocalize לְבִסְמִין, not לְבִסְמִין (p. 67). Instead of מִזְּקֶק (p. 68) read מִזְּקֶק. The editor has לְצִרְכָּה and לְצִרְכָּה promiscuously on p. 68. Both are inaccurate; vocalize לְצִרְכָּה. A comparison with חֲדָשִׁים would have taught the editor to vocalize חֲדָשִׁין, not חֲדָשִׁין (p. 73). According to 2 Chron. 19. 7 read מִפֶּחַ, not מִפֶּחַ (p. 74), which is a common error. The Kal of לָהּ signifies *he borrowed*; hence read תִּלְהֶה, not תִּלְהֶה (p. 80). For a similar reason read לְלוֹחַ instead of לְלוֹחַ (p. 81), as the Piel means *he accompanied*. It would be impossible to parse the form לְרוֹשׁ (p. 84); read לְרוֹשׁ. Vocalize also וְרוֹשׁ, instead of וְרוֹשׁ (*ibid.*). For רִשְׁאֵי (p. 85) read רִשְׁאֵי. Read אָנִים instead of אוֹנִים (p. 88 several times). According to the Bible we ought to read מִהַחֲלוֹנוֹת instead of מִהַחֲלוֹנוֹת (p. 94). Read הַמַּחֲרָשָׁה instead of הַמַּחֲרָשָׁה (p. 99). See 1 Sam. 13. 20. For אֶכְלֶנָּה (p. 99) read אֶכְלֶנָּה. Instead of לְקִיץ (p. 101) read לְקִיץ, as the root is קָצַץ. The Kal of פָּנָה does not suit on p. 101, hence read אֶת פָּנָה. The Kal of אֶת פָּנָה for אֶת פָּנָה. Instead of the impossible בִּינִיתִים (p. 102) read בִּינִיתִים. Some of the Genizah fragments vocalize בִּינִיתִים; but the former is more likely.

As indicated in the title, Dr. Arthur Rosenthal's edition of the tractate 'Orlah is of a rather ambitious character. In modern times some of the foremost Jewish scholars have attempted to apply to the Mishnah the principles of higher and lower criticism. These principles have led to wonderful discoveries in the Bible; but no startling results can be expected from them in the Mishnah. The problems of the latter are not so complicated, as we have an almost unbroken tradition which is of invaluable help as a starting-point. Nevertheless there is many a problem that still awaits solution. The labours of Hoffmann, Schwarz, Rosenthal (the father of the author of this work), and others have advanced this branch of study to a considerable extent. Dr. Arthur Rosenthal has followed their methods, and set himself the task of analysing the tractate 'Orlah and putting it on a critical basis. He first gives a general *résumé* of the composition and sources of this tractate, and then discusses each paragraph individually. It

goes without saying that an attempt is made to go beyond R. Judah ha-Nasi the redactor of the Mishnah. Every statement of the Mishnah is discussed separately, annotated, and translated into German. In these notes the general results of the introduction are given in detail. The main result of the inquiry is that R. Jose b. Ḥalafta, who is mentioned several times by name in this tractate, is the compiler thereof. Even some anonymous passages are shown by Dr. Rosenthal to belong to this Tanna. In many cases his proofs are convincing, especially when he treats of the development of the Halakah in the various tannaitic schools. But the arguments adduced from the similarity of phraseology cannot be regarded as conclusive. This is one of the most serious pitfalls in biblical criticism. Because a word is employed by a certain author it does not follow that all passages in which that word occurs must be ascribed to him. Bearing this view in mind one cannot accept Dr. Rosenthal's conclusions with regard to 2, 5 and 2, 12, where he tries to identify the author by the words שמעתי and שאלתי, respectively.

As the work is intended for scholars, the text is unvocalized. It is, however, a curious fact that the few words that are vocalized happen to be inaccurate. Thus מונה (1, 5) should have no *mappeh*, and ידלק (3, 1) should be ידלק, or ידלק. On the whole Dr. Rosenthal's work is an important contribution to the higher criticism of this tractate. The textual side, however, is almost entirely neglected. It seems that ולוקח (3, 9a) should probably be ולקח which harmonizes better with the remaining part of that paragraph.

The transliteration of Hebrew words is not always accurate.

Die Mischna, Kil'ajim (Verbotene Mischgattungen). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Nebst einem textkritischen Anhang. Von Dr. KARL ALBRECHT, Professor in Oldenburg i. Gr. Giessen: ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1914. pp. vi + 87.

Die Mischna, Rosch ha-schana (Neujahr). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Nebst einem textkritischen Anhang. Von Lic. PAUL FIEBIG, Oberlehrer in Gotha. Giessen: ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1914. pp. vii + 127.

Die Mischna, Horajot (Entscheidungen). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Nebst einem textkritischen Anhang. Von WALTER WINDFUHR, Pastor an St. Catharinen in Hamburg. Giessen: ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1914. pp. v + 35.

Essentially these three volumes do not differ in their treatment from their predecessors in the series of the Mishnah edited by Georg Beer and Oscar Holtzmann. There is a certain sameness about all the volumes that have hitherto appeared: the same kind of notes and the same kind of mistakes. They no doubt serve a useful purpose as text-books for non-Jewish students of theology, but can by no means be seriously considered as contributions to the scientific study of the Mishnah. The notes are for the greater part of an elementary nature, and there is little display of originality, in spite of the claims made by the general editors. A meritorious feature is the philological treatment of the texts.

The tractate Kil'ayim, dealing with the prohibition against crossing certain plants and animals (Lev. 19. 19; Deut. 22. 9-11), has its technical difficulties in identifying the numerous plants and animals mentioned therein, otherwise it is one of the easiest tractates of the Mishnah. The problem as to the reason of this prohibition does not belong to the province of mishnic studies, but to the Bible. For the Mishnah, while amplifying these laws, bases itself on the Bible, without investigating the reason. Moreover, even the technical difficulties have to a great extent been overcome by the exhaustive researches of Immanuel Löw to whom Prof. Albrecht constantly refers. Accordingly, the latter's claim made in his preface that his edition of Kil'ayim is the first modern attempt to give a comprehensive commentary is only true in a literal sense. His introduction, which is very brief, deals with the prohibition of Kil'ayim. He adopts Goldziher's view that this prohibition is connected with the magical and idolatrous practices of primitive races. As to the time of the composition of this tractate, Prof. Albrecht rightly points out that, since all the authorities cited, with the exception of R. Simon b. Eleazar, flourished before R. Judah ha-Nasi, there is no reason to doubt the unanimous tradition which ascribes the redaction of this

Mishnah to the latter. He, however, considers 1, 6 as a later interpolation, because that paragraph deals with animals, while the rest of the chapter treats of plants. But this argument is hardly of sufficient validity, as not all details of R. Judah ha-Nasi's method have been clearly determined, and it is quite possible that he himself, as well as another interpolator, might have been induced to insert that paragraph on account of the similar phraseology. This remark applies with equal force to 2, 8 a.

Owing to the great number of post-biblical nouns the vocalization of this tractate is by no means an easy matter. Arabic and Syriac, especially the latter, are sometimes very helpful, but cannot always be relied upon. For even a noun directly borrowed from these languages may undergo some vocalic changes in Hebrew. The exact pronunciation of some of these nouns must therefore be regarded as doubtful. To the credit of Prof. Albrecht it must be said that his vocalization is the most acceptable, or at least as acceptable as any that can be suggested. There are nevertheless some indefensible inaccuracies, a few of which may be mentioned here. Instead of *יִרְעִים* (2, 9 b) vocalize *יִרְעִים*. The plural of *קִרְחָה* is *קִרְחוֹת*, not *קִרְחוֹת* (2, 9 c), as the form is obviously like *נִפְתָּה*. In 3, 3 b *לִפְעֵ* is an infinitive like *לִתֵּן* (comp. *לִתַּת* 1 Kings 6. 19, which is probably a combination of *לִתַּת* and *לִתֵּן*). Such forms are the masculine infinitives instead of the feminine *לִפְעַת* and *לִתַּת* occurring in the Bible. Prof. Albrecht's suggestion to take *לִפְעֵ* as the so-called *l*-imperfect is precluded by the construction *מִבְּקֵשׁ לִפְעֵ*, as *מִבְּקֵשׁ* invariably takes an infinitive. He moves in a vicious circle when he refers to his *Grammar* in support of his explanation. *תִּדְּלֵק* (5, 7 b) should be *תִּדְּלֵק*, or *תִּדְּלֵק*, as the *Kal* is intransitive in that sense. The latter is more likely, as a passive form seems to be required. The vocalization *אֶדְלִי הַשֶּׁדֶה* (8, 5 b) is not quite sure. See also E. Fink, *Monatsschrift*, 1907, pp. 173-82; N. M. Nathan, *ibid.*, pp. 501-6. Instead of *מִטְפָּחוֹת* (9, 3) vocalize *מִטְפָּחוֹת*. Comp. Isa. 3. 22.

From a theological standpoint the tractate Rosh ha-Shanah offers a great deal of material for an introduction, especially if the writer has no particular desire to avoid digressions. Dr. Fiebig's

introduction is mainly devoted to the history of the New Moon and New Year Festivals, and at the same time the questions that are of immediate concern to the tractate are adequately dealt with. He gives a brief analysis of this mishnic tractate, and then compares it with the Tosephta. This comparison leads him to consider as probable Zuckerman's theory that the Tosephta is the old Palestinian Mishnah. There can, indeed, be no doubt that in spite of the numerous objections that have been raised against this fascinating theory, it is the only one which offers a reasonable solution to a difficult problem. Dr. Fiebig divides the history of the Jewish New Moon and New Year Festivals into six periods: 1. pre-exilic; 2. exilic and post-exilic; 3. Hellenistic; 4. tannaitic (from 100 B.C.E. to 100 C.E.); 5. amoraic and gaonic (down to 800 C.E.); 6. from the Middle Ages down to our present time. He adopts the current view that these Festivals had their origin in the cult of the moon, which is common to all primitive races who live in close proximity to nature. For the first two periods interesting details may be gleaned from passages in the Prophets and in the Pentateuch. In treating of the second period Dr. Fiebig cites and translates the scriptural passages appertaining to these Festivals. For the Hellenistic period Ben Sira contains a few passages, while for the remaining three periods ample material is to be found in the Talmud, in the gaonic literature, and in the present practice of the Jews. Of these two Festivals the New Year presents much greater difficulties, for there is no explicit mention of it in the Old Testament. And yet there can be no doubt of its antiquity. As a remarkable phenomenon in the development of religious practices it is to be observed that the New Moon, on which so much emphasis is laid in the Old Testament, became comparatively insignificant in post-biblical times, whereas the New Year, to which there is no clear allusion in the Bible and Apocrypha, assumed great importance from the time of the Mishnah down to our own times. A great deal of space is devoted by Dr. Fiebig to the liturgy of these Festivals. In this branch of his study he is entirely dependent upon Dr. Elbogen to whom he acknowledges his indebtedness. And

yet despite this reliable guide, Dr. Fiebig commits some glaring inaccuracies. Thus on p. 49, note 6, he remarks that the prayer 'Alenu is not only recited on New Year's Day, but also on the Sabbath and on the Day of Atonement. He refers to his own article in the *Christliche Welt*, 1909, No. 29, as authority on this prayer. He might have received more reliable information from the first Jew he met in the street. But it is common experience to find some Christian scholars better informed on difficult problems than on elementary subjects which Jewish scholars do not consider worthy of treatment.

Although most of the texts cited in the introduction have repeatedly been published and vocalized, Dr. Fiebig commits some blunders of an elementary character. On p. 28 אותות חדשים ומועדים is translated by *Zeiten, Monate und Feste*, and yet it does not require an advanced knowledge of Hebrew to find out that this phrase can mean nothing else than *signs of months and festivals*. On the same page ויעני העם ואמרו אמן is impossible Hebrew, and the correct reading is that of Müller, *Masseket Soferim*, p. 272, ונענו העם וכו'. Our editor quotes Müller's reading in the foot-note, and displays wonderful judgement in rejecting it. מלתה דרב אמרה (p. 48) should be rendered: *It is a statement which Rab made*. Dr. Fiebig's translation: *Ein Ausspruch des Rab sagt*, may be good German, but is clearly based on a misreading of the Aramaic expression. It should be vocalized מלתה דרב אמרה. P. 60, כמצינה עלינו בתורתך is impossible Hebrew; vocalize כמצינה as in all editions of the Siddur. Instead of לרצות (p. 67) vocalize לרצות, as the Piel of this verb signifies *he appeased*, which does not suit this context. There is no Hebrew word קצה (p. 68); vocalize קצה, which is a good biblical word. The plural of זכות and מלכות is זכויות and מלכויות, respectively, and not מלכויות (p. 42) and זכויות (p. 64). With regard to this mistake it must be said that Dr. Fiebig errs in good company. Similar errors likewise occur in the text of the tractate, which as a whole is fairly well vocalized. In the sentence ישלח יהוה מקבלין אלא מן המבדילין (2, 1 b) the object is understood, and the expression is in accordance with the mishnic idiom. But Dr. Fiebig appears to be puzzled by the active

participle, and in his notes remarks that one would expect מְפָרֵן, as if the latter were a passive participle! Instead of מְפָרֵן (2, 3) vocalize מְפָרֵן. Comp. 2 Sam. 3. 1, and elsewhere. מְפָרֵן לוֹ (2, 6 a) is out of harmony with מְפָרֵן of the co-ordinate clause. There is no doubt that the reading מְפָרֵן לוֹ mentioned in the *Textkritischer Anhang* is correct. The manuscripts or editions which have מְפָרֵן intended it to be an abbreviation. The expression מְפָרֵן אַחֵר (2, 9 c) is to be compared with רֵנָּה אַחֵר, and אַחֵר is not necessarily temporal. The punctuation מְפָרֵן (3, 7 b) is erroneous, as it is a Hebrew active participle like מְפָרֵן. Here again Dr. Fiebig errs in good company. The Hifl participle of פָּרָא would be מְפָרֵן not מְפָרֵן (4, 7). Dr. Fiebig quotes Margolis's *Lehrbuch der aram. Sprache des babyl. Talmuds*, where the same form occurs, but he forgets that there is some difference between Aramaic and Hebrew. Either we are to read מְפָרֵן or מְפָרֵן, the latter being a Piel. The vocalization מְפָרֵן (4, 8 a) is traditional, but, judging from analogous expressions, מְפָרֵן would be more accurate. מְפָרֵן (4, 9 a) is less natural than מְפָרֵן.

The importance of the tractate Horayot naturally lies in its exposition of the principles of the Jewish Halakah, and as it deals with abstract laws it is apparently of little interest to the Christian theologian, who fails to find in it a reflection of Jewish life in the time of Jesus. Hence one can easily understand Dr. Windfuhr's remark at the very outset of his preface that he laid the book aside with a sense of relief. Nevertheless the editor managed to analyse the contents of the tractate, and he intelligently attacked the problems appertaining thereto, though he did not advance the subject in the least. On the whole it may be said that the notes are replete with details, and acquaint the student with the subject under discussion. This is no easy matter in a tractate like Horayot, where various subjects are touched upon without being discussed or explained. In some cases Dr. Windfuhr failed to grasp the purport of the laws. Thus the phrase מְפָרֵן יום פְּנֵי יום (1, 3 b) is a well-known designation of a woman who has an issue of blood for one or two days between the seventh and eleventh days after the

beginning of her menstruation, and the words יוֹם בְּנִינָה are absolutely necessary, as the expression signifies one who observes a day of purity corresponding to the day of impurity. But Dr. Windfuhr offers the following translation: *die den festgesetzten [Reinheits]tag abwartet*. In his notes he remarks that the words יוֹם בְּנִינָה are a *pleonastischer Zusatz*. Nor is the vocalization free from errors. בְּנִינָה occurs only once in the Bible (1 Sam. 21. 10), and בְּנִינָה would certainly have been preferable in 1, 2. In the same paragraph שְׁנָה should be לְשָׁנָה. The Piel is transitive, and is therefore out of place here. In his notes Dr. Windfuhr quotes Bacher, who vocalizes שְׁנָה correctly, and yet, without giving any reason, he adopts an erroneous vocalization. This is a remarkable case of lack of philological judgement. Instead of בְּעִבּוּרָה וְנָרָה (1, 5 a and elsewhere) vocalize בְּעִבּוּרָה וְנָרָה. As וְנָרָה is undetermined, בְּעִבּוּרָה, too, must be undetermined. The Piel מְטַמְּאִין is transitive, and therefore impossible in 3, 4 b. Vocalize מְטַמְּאִין (Hithpael), and compare Lev. 21. 1, to which this law alludes. Instead of the impossible לְגִיר (3, 8) vocalize לְגִיר. Sense of style and a little knowledge of Hebrew grammar would have taught Dr. Windfuhr that לְכַתֵּב וְרוֹל (*ibid.*) is an impossible combination. Moreover, all the other co-ordinate nouns in this paragraph are undetermined. Vocalize לְכַתֵּב וְרוֹל. It should be observed that all these editors seem to have a tendency to put in as many definite articles as possible. They almost invariably give it 'the benefit of the doubt'. As a matter of fact in the mishnic idiom the definite article is less frequent with nouns than in the Bible, as may be readily seen from the usage of the word תְּחִמִּים.

Der Tosephtatraktat Roš Haššana. In vokalisiertem Text mit sprachlichen und sachlichen Bemerkungen. Von Lic. PAUL FIEBIG, Gymnasialoberlehrer in Gotha. Bonn: A. MARCUS UND E. WEBER, 1914. pp. 16.

This edition of the Tosephta Rosh ha-Shanah belongs to a series of small texts edited by Hans Lietzmann. It is designed to meet the requirements of students at the University, and lays no claim to original contribution. It supplies the reader with all

necessary information. In a few well-chosen sentences the editor acquaints the learner with the nature of the edition, and refers for fuller information to his publication of the Mishnah Rosh ha-Shanah under the editorship of Beer and Holtzmann. (That publication is reviewed in another place.) The text mainly follows Zuckermann's edition of the Erfurt manuscript. In the notes, which are brief and of a very elementary character, some of the important variants are recorded. In some cases, however, the notes are quite superfluous. Thus one cannot see the necessity of writing special notes offering the information that עֵגֶל means a *calf* and קִידָּ means a *kid* (p. 6, notes 13 and 14), as these words are of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament. If Dr. Fiebig assumed that the reader's knowledge is of such a low standard, he might as well have taken the trouble to annotate every word. And yet even post-biblical words are frequently passed over without notes. He would have utilized his space more profitably had he explained the etymology of מִתְחִילִין (1, 3) and הוֹרְמִין (1, 9). He might also have given the etymology of פִּרְנָם (2, 3).

In such a text the accuracy of vocalization is of great importance, as the student is expected to derive his Hebrew knowledge from these sources. There is an evident endeavour in this tractate to punctuate correctly, but an imperfect knowledge of Hebrew prevented Dr. Fiebig from carrying out his desire. לְהַרְשִׁים (1, 1) violates an elementary rule. Comp. 1 Chron. 23. 31, where it is לְהַרְשִׁים. From the Bible Dr. Fiebig might likewise have known to punctuate עֲצָרָת, not עֲצָרָת (1, 2, and throughout the book). The exact pronunciation of רַבְעִי of the *fourth year* is not definitely known. Dr. Fiebig has it as רִבְעִי (1, 8), which in itself is not unlikely. We should perhaps vocalize it רִבְעִי, as a derivative from רַבְעִים (see e.g. Exod. 20. 5). In a punctuated text וְנִבְעַתְתִּי (1, 15) is out of place; read וְנִבְעַתִּי. For קִימִין (2, 2 b) read קִימִין. It is common to consider the word קִישׁ as a Hifil form of the root קָשׂ, and Dr. Fiebig, too, vocalizes it לְהִקִּישׁ (2, 3). But, as there is no clear evidence for the existence of such a root with this signification, why not derive קִישׁ from קִישׁ like Arabic قَسَسَ? One should accordingly read לְהִקִּישׁ.

Instead of נִקְב (2, 4) read נִקֵּב, as the former is Piel and transitive. There are also a few misprints like בְּתוֹכָהּ (4, 2), instead of בְּתוֹכָהּ; בְּפָנֶי (4, 6) for בְּפָנֶי; פְּקֻדוֹת (4, 7 a) for פְּקֻדוֹת.

Babylonische Geonim im nachgaonischen Zeitalter, nach handschriftlichen und gedruckten Quellen. Von SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI. Berlin: MAYER UND MÜLLER, 1914. pp. x + 144.

Our knowledge of the gaonic period has been recently enriched with some very interesting details owing chiefly to the discovery of the Genizah. Many problems were solved, but at the same time new difficulties arose through the investigation of the new material. That period, which is no doubt one of the most fascinating in Jewish history, has always occupied the minds of Jewish scholars, and despite the paucity of material many a fact has been reclaimed from oblivion. Yet some of the views that have hitherto been considered as settled will have to be revised. It had long ago been accepted as an established fact that the gaonate proper ceased to exist with the death of R. Hai in 1038. There are explicit statements to that effect to be found in the writings of mediaeval Jewish historians, as for instance in Neubauer's *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, vol. I, p. 178. It is true that there are in some books sporadic references to Geonim, who flourished after that date. But these references were either ignored or explained away in one manner or another. For it is an indisputable fact that the title Gaon is not always employed in its technical sense, and even Sherira in his *Epistle* uses it somewhat loosely. (Comp. Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 31, 32.) Here again the Genizah fragments and manuscripts recently brought to light have somewhat modified the old established theories. Persistent references to post-gaonic Geonim caused scholars to investigate anew this phase of Jewish history, and to re-examine the old material in the light of recent discoveries. It soon became apparent that the academy still lingered on for some time after the extinction of the gaonate. Its importance was diminished owing to the absence of a really great man to succeed R. Hai. Subsequently in the twelfth century

a serious attempt was made to re-establish the gaonate in Bagdad, and to restore it to its pristine glory. Other countries, too, endeavoured to found the office of gaonate. In Palestine Geonim existed even during the brilliant epoch of the Babylonian gaonate. Sufficient details about Ben Meir are still lacking, but there can be no doubt that his acrimonious strife with Sa'adya was more than a mere controversy over the calendar.

All these questions have never before been exhaustively investigated, and Dr. Poznański has put scholars under very great obligation by collecting and examining all the existing material, some of which has hitherto been inaccessible. With his characteristic thoroughness and wonderful mastery of details he presents in this monograph all the facts that can possibly be gleaned. By piecing the fragments together he draws a picture of those Geonim and the times they lived in. This picture, to be sure, is still dim; but this is due to the lack of further documents which even the historian cannot supply. It is, however, to be hoped that no time will be lost in exploring the Genizah that is now housed at Cambridge and elsewhere. Thus even the small collection at the Dropsie College contains a fragment which is of great value for the period to which Dr. Poznański's monograph is devoted. It is a dirge on the death of a Gaon named Daniel written on a narrow strip of parchment in a large character. On one side of the fragment is a marriage document dated Fustaṭ, 1063. The bridegroom's name is Jepheth the son of Nissim, and the bride's name is Sitt al-Dar the daughter of Isaac. The marriage document is incomplete, and from the appearance of the fragment it is evident that the copyist trimmed it in order to use its blank side for the dirge. This dirge is written in the Wāfir metre, which is quite a favourite with the mediaeval Jewish poets whose mother-tongue was Arabic. The rhyme thereof is אים throughout. Our fragment contains the last sixteen lines of the dirge, and begins with the line:

בְּדִנְיָאֵל נָאֻן רֵאשִׁי יְשִׁיבֹת
בְּחֻמֹּתַי כְּמַרְוֹת הַנְּשִׂאִים

Now it is sufficiently obvious from the context that the man, on whose death this dirge was written, was named Daniel. The supposition that the poet compared the object of his praise to Daniel of the Bible may be dismissed as unworthy of consideration. But the death of which Daniel does the poet lament? There are four post-gaonic Geonim who bore that name: Daniel b. Azariah, Gaon of Palestine; Daniel b. Eleazar b. Hibat Allah, Gaon of Bagdad; Daniel b. Abi al-Rabi' ha-Kohen, Gaon of Bagdad; Daniel the Babylonian, who was vice-Gaon. Our dirge contains no more than general praises which could easily apply to any man, and we have no definite data wherewith to identify this Daniel. I, however, venture to put forth the conjecture that the author of this dirge is Eleazar b. Jacob. The style of this poem is smooth and fluent, but lacks that depth which is found in our great poets. And these are just the characteristics of Eleazar b. Jacob. There are also resemblances in phraseology, as for instance p. 75, l. 15 of this monograph. This point, it must be owned, cannot be pressed too far, as minor poets who lack originality will often borrow the same phrases from their model. Should this hypothesis prove to be right, the dirge would refer to Daniel b. Abi al-Rabi', to whom Jacob b. Eleazar addressed several panegyrics, as well as a dirge on his death and the death of his son Azariah (see below). Of course there is still the possibility that the subject of the dirge is Daniel b. Azariah, the Palestinian Gaon, who died about 1062, a year before the date of the marriage document. It may also lament the death of a Daniel who lived in Egypt, of whom nothing is as yet known.

Dr. Poznański's studies are chiefly based on the books of the twelfth-century travellers, Benjamin of Tudela and Pethahiah of Regensburg, on the Diwan of Eleazar b. Jacob, brought from Aleppo by Elkan N. Adler in 1898, and upon an Arabic fragment of the Mohammedan historian Abu Tālib b. Anjab ibn al-Sha'i, who flourished in the thirteenth century. About a third part of the book is taken up with the real subject of the monograph as indicated by the title. All the details that are known about the nine Geonim of Bagdad are presented in a masterly fashion.

The rest of the book consists of the following six appendixes: I. Samuel b. 'Ali's a responsum addressed to Moses of Kiew, and an exposition of Ketubot 63 a. II. Part of an Arabic letter by Maimonides addressed to his pupil Joseph b. Judah ibn 'Aḳnin. III. Extracts from the Diwan of Eleazar b. Jacob ha-Babli. IV. An 'Aḳedah by the Gaon 'Ali II. V. Non-Geonim with the title of Gaon. VI. Exilarchs in post-gaonic times. Of these appendixes the first four are interesting texts which directly or indirectly bear upon the historical phases discussed in the monograph. The last two are independent studies which are almost complete in themselves, and are printed here in order to furnish the sketch a proper background. Appendix V is especially replete with facts which were quite unknown up till recently. It treats of the Palestinian Geonim whose existence was made known through Dr. Schechter's discovery of the *Megillat Ebiatar* (*Saadyana*, XXXVIII); Geonim in Egypt; a list of scholars who were styled Gaon as a mark of respect by later writers. The last list is arranged alphabetically, and is by no means exhaustive. The sixth appendix contains the names of exilarchs who flourished after the gaonic epoch in Fustaṭ, Bagdad, Mosul, and Damascus. The exilarchs of the Rabbanites are followed by a list of exilarchs among the Karaites.

In a subject of this nature where the material is as yet scanty, and where more discoveries may confidently be expected, provisional hypotheses are unavoidable. Dr. Poznański, who is one of the most careful and productive scholars, is naturally an extremely reliable guide, and is most suitable for this pioneer work. He makes use of clever combinations, and identifies persons in the most ingenious manner. Nevertheless some of the conjectures are far from being convincing. They are such as can at present neither be established nor refuted, and hence it would be useless to offer counter-suggestions. I, however, wish to make a few remarks in connexion with the texts. The suffix of אֲכָהֲרֵהָא (p. 58, l. 3) refers to מוֹאֲצֵעַ, which is a broken plural, and therefore the suggestion to read אֲכָהֲרֵהֶם (note 2) is unnecessary. אֲרִצָּא (p. 59, note 5) should perhaps be read אֲרִצָּא, that is to say, אֲרִצָּא.

a worm. The meaning of the sentence would then be: *Do not treat that man as a worm, for if he has no wisdom, he has old age.* Instead of the unintelligible אלגבא (p. 60, note 5) we should read some such word as אנקלאבא. The obvious אלגאלב does not suit the context. נעלמים (p. 63, l. 39 b) should be נאלמים, parallel to לעור. The metre, which is Basit, demands the insertion of כל after העוב (p. 65, l. 10). In the next line read מרצחת instead of רוצחת. It is also possible to read ורוצחת, and to take the verse as if it were איך הורגה ורוצחת איש ואביוהו. For ותעבור (*ibid.*, l. 26) read something like גם תעביר. The meaning of מעשיו לשון (*ibid.*, l. 34) is: *The tongue of all sons of men declares his deeds*, and not *Macht jede Zunge reden*, as suggested by Poznański. מעשיו is masculine, while לשון is feminine; hence the feminine participle משוחחת should have the latter as its subject. Instead of יהי צדקם יהי (*ibid.*, l. 41) read יהי צדקם. According to the metre, which is Wafir, we should read איך instead of ואיך (p. 66, l. 20). Instead of שץ (p. 67, No. 20, l. 1) vocalize שח. Line 2 of No. 166 (p. 68) should perhaps read ששון וקול. שמחה בימין תשמעו. The next line should be completed by the insertion of פְּרָכִי. Line 10 of the same poem (p. 69) should be completed by עולָמִי. At the beginning of the following line לְבֹא would suit the context and the metre, which is Kāmil. There is no difficulty in explaining No. 167, l. 6 (p. 69), which reads:

דתך לישר את הדורינו אחת והורות את נבוכינו

It should be rendered: *Thy only law (i.e. thy aim and occupation) is to make our crooked straight and to guide our perplexed.* Poznański in note 6 remarks that אחת is an *augenscheinlicher Fehler*. But it is quite correct, and is to be construed with דתך. Comp. Esther 4. 11. The metre demands זרעך for זרעך (*ibid.*, l. 11). Read ואיך instead of איך (No. 170, l. 14, p. 71). Delete ו ואיש (No. 176, l. 21, p. 72). The vocalization פְּלִיָּחַת (No. 178, l. 2, p. 72) is against grammar and metre; read פְּלִיָּחַת. ויהיו (*ibid.*, l. 10) is short of a syllable; read ויהיינה. As the root of מהלות (*ibid.*, l. 12) is הלל, it should be vocalized מְהַלֵּלֹת, not מְהַלֹּת. It is strange that the few words that are vocalized are

nearly all wrong. In the Arabic superscription of 203 (p. 74) the manuscript has *ווקף הו בנפסה אורדהא פי אלגמאעה*, and Goldziher emends *אורדהא* into *איראדהא*. This is too radical a change, and the sentence still remains slightly awkward. Read simply *ואורדהא*, and render: *He himself stood up, and recited it before the assembly*. It is also possible to insert a ו before *בנפסה*. This ו may have fallen out after *הו*. *שם* (*ibid.*, l. 15, p. 75) gives no sense; read *שם*. Instead of *חודש* (*ibid.*, l. 19) read *חבש*. Comp. Job 40. 3. *במחמירו* (p. 76, l. 20) should be *במחמאו*. Brody emends it into *במחמאות*; but next to *ושמנו* my suggestion is preferable, especially as we only have to assume that א was misread as יר. Instead of *לב* (p. 77, l. 39) read *לבב*. The metre of 'Ali's '*Akedah* (p. 78) is Kāmil. Poznański does not give the name of the metre, but merely a row of straight and curved lines. The number of his lines, however, does not tally with the syllables, as another straight line should be added at the end. Delete the ה of *השלשלת* (stanza 3, l. 5), and the second ו of *צורו* (stanza 4, l. 2). Before *ליצחק* (*ibid.*, l. 3) two long syllables are missing; some such word as *נדיב* should perhaps be supplied.

Die Petichot des Midrasch rabba zu Leviticus. Von Dr. DAVID KÜNSTLINGER. Krakau: Verlag des Verfassers, 1913. pp. 38.
Die Petichot des Midrasch rabba zu Genesis. Von Dr. DAVID KÜNSTLINGER. Krakau: Verlag des Verfassers, 1914. pp. 51.

The scientific study of the Midrash has the same difficulties and problems as are met with in all the other branches of Jewish literature. Nevertheless the literary and textual criticism of the various Midrashim has made slow but steady progress since the time of Zunz. Theodor's edition of the Midrash rabba, of which only a small portion has hitherto appeared, shows the excellent results that have already been attained. Dr. Künstlinger has devoted himself to a special branch of the literary criticism of the Midrash, namely, to the analysis of the opening addresses known as *Petiḥot*. In his book *Altjüdische Bibeldeutung*, which was published in 1911, he established certain prin-

ciples whereby the genuine Petiḥot may be distinguished from the spurious. This is by no means an easy matter, as redactors and copyists, especially the former, tampered with the original form of these addresses. As they now stand, the Petiḥot are frequently inaccurate, and the names of the authorities are not always given correctly. The superficial mode of treatment of regarding as a Petiḥah every address beginning with פתח would not take the investigator very far, for manuscripts as well as printed editions vary in this respect. There is many a passage which begins with פתח in some manuscripts and editions, while in others it is preceded by another formula. Dr. Künstlinger rightly points out that in this investigation external evidence is misleading owing to the interpolations of the redactors. But guided by the general principles he successfully analysed the Petiḥot of the Pesikṭa d'Rab Kahana in a book which appeared in 1912. He now offers a similar analysis of Leviticus and Genesis rabba. He only gives his own independent results, and refrains from discussing the work of other scholars in this field of research. His presentation is, accordingly, constructive, and is an interesting contribution to the higher criticism of the Midrash. As Dr. Künstlinger endeavours to go beyond the oldest manuscripts, his results can only be considered plausible, but not final.

תולדת הדרומים ביחסיהם אל הגלילים בתקופת האמוראים.
מאת יעקב שמואל שעזאק. חלק ראשון.

[Paris : IMPRIMERIE DANZIG, 1914. pp. vii + 150.]

Geschichte der Methodologie in den Hochschulen Judäas, Galiläas, Suras, und Nehardäas. Von JACOB SAMUEL ZURI-SCHESAK, Lehrer am hebr. Gymnasium in Jerusalem. Erster Teil. Jerusalem : BUCHDRUCKEREI 'ACHDUTH', 1914. pp. v + 160.

It is an old axiom that the characteristics of nations or groups of individuals are reflected in their literary productions. But in order to investigate the mental traits of an author we have

to establish the authenticity of his writings. This is no easy task when one attempts to draw a picture of the numerous amoraic authorities mentioned in the Talmudim and Midrashim. For in this literature we have no coherent and consecutive writings of any single individual, but a conglomeration of questions and answers and pithy sayings uttered at various occasions. The difficulties are still more enhanced when an attempt is made to group the various authorities geographically, and to describe the general characteristics shared by the different individuals constituting each group or school. In many cases we have no apparent data as to the origin of the scholars. It is just this difficult subject which Mr. Schesak has set for himself. He believes that there is abundant material for a comprehensive study, and that much can be achieved by a careful and painstaking investigation of every statement recorded in the Talmud. He displays very deep insight, and penetrates into the characters of the various Amoraim, and presents a vivid picture of their frame of mind. After giving a brief characterization of each Amora, he cites sayings from the Talmudim and Midrashim to bear out his theories. The first book, the first volume of which is now complete, deals specifically with the Amoraim of southern Palestine. By very ingenious conjectures Mr. Schesak endeavours to ascertain the place of birth and education of a number of authorities of whom little is definitely known. In some cases, however, he moves in a vicious circle. Mr. Schesak assumes general characteristics for the Amoraim of the south, and if an Amora happens to possess these characteristics he is taken to belong to that group. This method, to say the least, is very precarious. Moreover, our author's characterizations are too definite to be accurate. It is impossible to lay down hard and fast rules about the frame of mind and point of view of the authorities mentioned in the Talmud. Human nature is too complex to be reduced to simple equations. As an instance of Mr. Schesak's tendency towards generalizations the following assertion may be cited. He says that the difference between the system of the Amoraim of the south (Judea) and that of the Galileans is to some extent the

same as the difference between classicism and modernism. The former look at life indirectly, and study man through his works, while the latter penetrate straight into the human heart (p. vi). As a matter of fact, it is even hard to draw the line of demarcation between classicism and modernism, and Mr. Schesak's definition will not stand too close an examination. Furthermore, the distinction between the Amoraim of Galilee and those of the south cannot be sharply drawn, as after all these men lived during the same period and in practically the same environments. Their goal, too, was identical, and there no doubt was an interchange of teachers in the various academies which helped to obliterate the original differences, if any existed. In spite of this objection to Mr. Schesak's mode of treatment, his point of view will command attention.

The second book, the first volume of which has now appeared, is of a more general character. It deals with the methodology of all the Amoraim. Here again the author emphasizes the radical difference in method that existed in the various academies. The results of the first book are taken for granted. The author's fondness for generalizations is manifest also in this book. On p. 73 he makes the sweeping assertion that the Nehardeans were interpreters, whereas the Syrians and Palestinians were creators. Apart from this tendency Mr. Schesak displays great erudition and mastery of his subject. He handles his material very skillfully, even when his results are too bold to commend themselves to scholars.

Both books are written in a very good Hebrew. The author's style, which belongs to the latest phase of modern Hebrew, is fluent, and well suited for the treatment of this subject. Mr. Schesak expresses himself with clearness and precision, and avoids unnecessary coinages. As such books are rare in modern Hebrew, the author ought to be encouraged to continue the publication of the remaining volumes, as well as his other books to which he refers.

Jesus in the Talmud. His personality, his disciples, and his sayings. By BERNHARD PICK, Ph.D., D.D. Chicago: THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1913. pp. 103.

To the student of the Talmud the scanty references to Jesus that occur in the unexpurgated editions of that vast literature are, to say the least, a negligible quantity. Considering the size of rabbinic literature, one must come to the inevitable conclusion that Christ and Christianity left little or no impression on the teachers of the Talmud, who treated the new religion and its founder with indifference. On the other hand, when one excerpts these few references out of their context, collects them, and annotates them, they loom large, and are apt to become unduly prominent. These passages have been repeatedly collected, and have done the Jews incalculable harm. In recent years a more scientific treatment, which is sometimes a mere guise, has been accorded these passages. This little book is not an original contribution. It simply follows Dalman's collection, and shows no first-hand knowledge of the Talmud. And yet the author speaks with a tone of authority. His remarks, which are interspersed between the quotations, betray an unmistakable anti-Jewish tendency. As these remarks are not new, it is scarcely worth while to controvert them. The views of Jewish scholars are dismissed by him as biassed. When a non-Jewish scholar happens to side with them, he discounts his view by quoting the opinions of 'unbiassed' Christians. Thus against Renan, who thinks that the Talmud and the Rabbis were copied by Jesus, he (p. 73) pits 'a better authority, the late Dunlap Moore, for many years missionary among the Jews' (we know that scholarly type!). Nor is it easy to see why, from a scientific standpoint, Jewish scholars are biassed, whereas Christian writers monopolize the absolute truth. The former at least have the merit of knowing the Talmud in its true perspective. Dr. Pick triumphantly quotes the views of Wellhausen and Dean Farrar. This is, however, not scientific evidence. Wellhausen is one of the foremost Semitists and literary critics of our age, and

Dean Farrar was a graceful writer ; but their knowledge of the Talmud is practically nil : the former would not, and the latter could not read rabbinic literature.

Meziza: Ist sie religiös geboten? Wirkt sie heilend oder schädlich? Von EMANUEL ROSENBAUM, Praktischer Arzt in Paris. Frankfurt a. M. : SÄNGER AND FRIEDBERG, 1913. pp. 47.

The question of Meṣiṣah, that is to say, the sucking of the blood after circumcision, has been repeatedly discussed. Many physicians have condemned this practice on hygienic grounds. It has been urged that hereditary diseases may be communicated by the infant to the one who performs the operation, and it is possible for the former to be inoculated with harmful germs in this manner. Nevertheless this practice continues. Dr. Rosenbaum in this pamphlet tries to prove the untenability of this objection. He first points out that ritually Meṣiṣah is essential. This part of his work is hardly necessary, as rabbinical testimony is unanimous on this point. He then goes on to demonstrate physiologically that the performance of Meṣiṣah helps to heal the wound, and cites famous medical authorities in support of his view. He finally proves that the infant can neither communicate nor be inoculated with diseases. The first few pages of this treatise is devoted to the definition of Meṣiṣah, and to the talmudic use of the root מציץ. He takes issue with J. Levy, who declares in his *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch* that the omission of Meṣiṣah is not harmful, and that the root מציץ can be applied to the absorption by lifeless things. Dr. Rosenbaum's language in discussing this question is far from dignified. Moreover, to obviate all difficulties there are instruments well adapted to the performance of this rite. One of these instruments has been applied with great success by Mr. Alexander Tertis, of London. This gentleman published a pamphlet containing the opinions of several Rabbis, who emphatically state that the Jewish law does not stipulate that the Meṣiṣah should

be done with the mouth. Many of the letters of these Rabbis appeared in the Hebrew weekly *Hayehoody* during the year 1901. Dr. Rosenbaum does not seem to be aware of this mass of correspondence. At the end of the book Dr. Rosenbaum makes a solemn declaration that the last thousand cases that have come under his notice have almost been entirely successful. This, however, does not prove that there is no possibility of danger.

B. HALPER.

Dropsie College.